

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action mailed on January 8, 2007, within the three month shortened statutory period for reply. Claims 1-4, 7-15, 19, 23-43 and 46-62 were pending and the Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 7-15, 19, 23, 30-43 and 46-62, and claims 24-29 are allowable. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, 13, 14, 30, 33-36, 43, 47-49, 54-56, 59, 60, and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller, U.S. Patent No. 5,700,037 ("Keller"), in view of Smith, U.S. Patent No. 5,208,110 ("Smith"), Tuttle et al. U.S. Pat. No. 5,988,510 ("Tuttle") and Lockwood et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,555,877. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants thank the Examiner for providing his summary of his basis for rejecting the infrared blocking transaction card, as set forth in the pending claims. However, Applicants assert that the main motivation for creating the present invention (as set forth in the Background of the Specification at, for example, paragraphs 0019-0024) is that existing transaction cards with transparent portions through the cards were not able to be recognized by an ATM device. In particular, the ATM card reader would send an IR beam across the card path such that, when the card is inserted into the reader, the IR beam emitted from the LED is interrupted, re-directed or blocked by the card body to thereby inform the ATM that a card was inserted. However, the IR beam would not be reflected off of the transparent portion of the card, thereby creating a problem when using the transparent cards in ATM devices.

As suggested by the Examiner, if transaction cards included Acrylic as a component of the adhesive, then the transparent transaction cards should have been recognized in the ATM devices. Unfortunately, such cards are not recognized by the ATM device.


Moreover, as suggested by the Examiner, Acrylic is used as an adhesive which is deposited between the layers of the cards and not over the outside surface of the card. No legitimate reason would exist to deposit an adhesive on the outside surface of a card. In fact, including an adhesive on the outside surface of the card would literally destroy the intended functionality of the card. For example, the adhesive would have a tacky or sticky surface, thereby causing a multitude of problems on the outside surface of a card such as, the card

sticking inside a wallet, not properly sliding into an ATM machine, and sticking to other surfaces (e.g., POS devices, the restaurant bill, etc.). As such, no motivation exists whatsoever to deposit such Acrylic adhesive on the outside surface of the card. Accordingly, neither Keller, Smith, Tuttle, Lockwood, nor any combination thereof, disclose or suggest at least "a machine recognizable compound containing an infrared blocking material, said machine recognizable compound substantially uniformly covering an outer surface of said portion of said card that is substantially transmissive to visible light," (emphasis added) as similarly recited in independent claims 1, 33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 62.

Claims 2, 4, 9-11, 13, 14, 30, 35, 43, 47-49, 54-56, 59, 60, and 62 variously depend from claims 1 and 33, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42 and contain all of the respective elements thereof. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are likewise differentiated from the cited references at least for the same reasons as set forth above, in addition to their own respective features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is thus requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: February 26, 2007

By: _____
Howard I. Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com